

REMARKS

Drawings

The Examiner has requested that Figures 1 (a) - 1 (b) be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Applicant includes herewith formal drawings that have such a legend appended to Figures 1 (a) - 1 (b).

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-12, 14-15

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-12, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kim (US 5,854,513).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, and 14-15. The Kim reference cited by the Examiner teaches an unsegmented BLM (25) that is located over two bond pads (22, 23). See Figure 6. A bump (41) is located over the BLM (25).

In contrast, an embodiment of Applicant's invention, as claimed in claim 1, as amended, includes a bond pad (21B), a BLM located over the bond pad, where the BLM is split into two segments (24N, 24N), where the segments are in close proximity to each other, where the segments are separated by a gap, and a bump (25) that is located over the segments. See Figure 2a. Also, see lines 15-16 and 18-19 on page 6 of the specification.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's citation of Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary definition of "segment", the Kim reference does not teach a BLM that is split into two segments, that are in close proximity to each other, and are separated by a gap. Thus, the Kim reference cited by the Examiner does not teach each and every element of Applicant's invention. Consequently, Kim does not anticipate claim 1 of Applicant's invention. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 11-12, and 14-15 are dependent on claim 1 and, thus, are also not anticipated by Kim.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-12, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b).

Claims 26-28

The Examiner has rejected claims 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kim (US 5,854,513).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. The Kim reference cited by the Examiner teaches an unsegmented BLM (25) that is located over two bond pads (22, 23). See Figure 6. A bump (41) is located over the BLM (25).

In contrast, an embodiment of Applicant's invention, as claimed in claim 26, claims a bond pad having two or more segments and a wire lead that is attached to the segments.

The Kim reference cited by the Examiner does not teach a wire lead. Thus, the Kim reference cited by the Examiner does not teach each and every element of Applicant's invention. Consequently, Kim does not anticipate claim 26 of Applicant's invention. Claims 27-28 are dependent on claim 26 and, thus, are also not anticipated by Kim.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to claims 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b).

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claim 4

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 5,854,513) and Tadauchi et al. (US 6,464,122).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Applicant's invention, as claimed in claim 4, would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of semiconductor packaging at the time the invention was made. The Kim reference cited by the Examiner fails to teach a bond pad (21B), a BLM located over the bond pad, where the BLM is split into two segments (24N, 24N), where the segments are in close proximity to each other, where the segments are separated by a gap, and a bump (25) that is located over the segments. See Figure 2a. Also, see lines 15-16 and 18-19 on page 6 of the specification. Thus, a combination of Kim and Tadauchi et al. would not produce Applicant's invention, as claimed in claim 4. Since the two references cited by the Examiner do not teach, suggest, or render obvious the invention as claimed by Applicant, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a).

Claims 5, 8-10, and 13

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 8-10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 5,854,513) and Fukuda et al. (Kokai 05-013418).

The Examiner had actually cited Takada et al. (sic), but Applicant believes that this reflects an inadvertent error by the Examiner. Applicant further believes that the Examiner intended to cite Fukuda et al., which was originally cited by

Applicant to the Examiner in an IDS on August 15, 2002. However, in the event that the Examiner did indeed intend to cite a reference that is called Takada et al., Applicant herewith requests that the Examiner provide a complete and correct citation so that Applicant may timely obtain and review a copy of the reference.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Applicant's invention, as claimed in claims 5, 8-10, and 13, would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of semiconductor packaging at the time the invention was made. The Kim reference cited by the Examiner fails to teach a bond pad (21B), a BLM located over the bond pad, where the BLM is split into two segments (24N, 24N), where the segments are in close proximity to each other, where the segments are separated by a gap, and a bump (25) that is located over the segments. See Figure 2a. Also, see lines 15-16 and 18-19 on page 6 of the specification. Thus, a combination of Kim and Tadauchi et al. would not produce Applicant's invention, as claimed in claims 5, 8-10, and 13. Since the two references cited by the Examiner do not teach, suggest, or render obvious the invention as claimed by Applicant, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 5, 8-10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a).

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all claims pending are now in condition for allowance so such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.